

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of December 29, 2009 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 14-1437.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 29-31, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,219,653 to O'Neill, *et al.* (hereinafter O'Neill), U.S. Patent 6,642,946 to Janes, *et al.* (hereinafter Janes), U.S. Patent 5,491,795 to Beaudet, *et al.* (hereinafter Beaudet), U.S. Patent 5,761,429 to Thompson (hereinafter Thompson), and U.S. Patent 5,940,813 to Hutchings (hereinafter Hutchings). Claims 8 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, Thompson, and Hutchings, in further view of U.S. Patent 6,182,052 to Fulton, *et al.* (hereinafter Fulton). Claims 9-11, and 33-25 were rejected under under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, Thompson, and Hutchings, in further view of U.S. Patent 7,051,072 to Stewart, *et al.* (hereinafter Stewart).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections and thus have not amended the claims.

Certain Aspects Of The Invention

It may be useful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by Claim 1, is a computer-implemented method of displaying e-commerce partners within an e-commerce system including an e-commerce application and a commerce graphical user

interface, the e-commerce application enabling an e-commerce entity to conduct business with e-commerce partners via a communicatively linked network.

The method can include for each of the e-commerce partners automatically determining by an active engine of the e-commerce application whether the e-commerce partner is an active partner based on at least one predetermined criteria. Determining whether the e-commerce partner is an active partner can comprise at least one of the following steps, each step being based on a corresponding criterion: detecting whether a transaction has occurred with the e-commerce partner within a designated time period, determining whether transactions involving the e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold, determining whether a transaction involving the e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size, and determining whether the e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level. The corresponding criteria for determining whether an e-commerce partner is an active partner can be adjustable.

The method also can include presenting a list of active e-commerce partners within the commerce graphical user interface, each active e-commerce; and when the partner node is expanded, presenting at least one transaction node as a child node of the expanded partner node. Each transaction node can represent an e-commerce transaction between the e-commerce entity and the e-commerce partner;

The method further can include visually differentiating different types of transaction nodes and different categories of partner nodes, wherein error transaction nodes are highlighted and automatically expanded responsive to an error detection; and assigning by a transaction router of the e-commerce application responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules, wherein the predetermined rules are adjustable, and wherein most qualified personnel is assigned to most profitable transactions.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0017] and [0041]; see also Figs. 1-4.

The Claims Define Over The Cited References

The present invention provides a mechanism for business entities engaged in electronic commerce to quickly detect and react to business transaction errors. This mechanism automatically determines whether an e-commerce partner is an active partner based on at least one predetermined adjustable criteria and displays only active partners as expandable partner nodes with transactions as child nodes and visually differentiates different types of transaction nodes and different categories of partner nodes, thus allowing a business entity to prioritize different business transactions by importance so that preferential treatment and support can be afforded to key business partners and transactions. The ability to react differently to more important business partners and transactions can be especially valuable in situations where the administrative personnel that oversee electronic commerce transactions are limited.

O'Neill discloses a freight calculation system including a seller client, a buyer client, and a platform coupled to the seller client and the buyer client using a communication network. The seller client generates freight data and communicates it using a communication network. The buyer client communicates a delivery request for a load using the communication network. The delivery request specifies one of a number of delivery containers, an origination location, and a destination location. The platform receives and stores the freight data and determines a delivery cost for the load using the freight data, the specified delivery container, the origination location, and the destination location. See the Abstract.

Clearly, the subject matter of O'Neill, which concerns freight calculation, has nothing to do with the subject matter of the present invention, which concerns displaying active partners and transactions in a visually distinguishable manner (especially error transaction nodes are highlighted and automatically expanded responsive to an error

detection) so that more qualified personnel can be assigned to more important partners and transactions (such as error transactions).

O'Neill discloses in col. 16, lines 35-45 that a user of the trading client 26 can change the trading status of the trading client 26 of the system 10 in response to market forces. For example, a user of a seller client 24 that realizes its inventory is in short supply due to a sudden manufacturing problem may inactivate the trading status of the trading client 26 of system 10 for a period of time to reevaluate its price and availability levels for its current inventory. During the time that the trading status of the seller client 24 is inactive, a buyer client 22 may not access the inventory data of the seller client 24. Upon addressing the manufacturing problem, or after a suitable period of time, a user of the seller client 24 may reactivate the trading status of the seller client 24 of system 10 by activating Trading Status field 134. Subsequently, a buyer client 22 may access the inventory data of the active seller client 24.

Clearly, the trading status described in O'Neill does not refer to the status of an e-commerce partner determined by at least one of predetermined adjustable criteria according to the present invention. Rather, in O'Neill the seller changes its own status, not the status of a partner (for example, a buyer), to inactive when there is a manufacturing problem.

Although O'Neill discloses that the seller client can establish trading preferences among its trading partners (see col. 8, lines 37-38; col. 10, line 63-col. 11, line 9; col. 11, lines 45-53), O'Neill does not disclose that the status (active or inactive) of the trading partners should be determined based on the preferences.

FIG. 9 of O'Neill illustrates Trading Partners subgroup 206 of Sellers group 102. Trading Partners subgroup 206 includes a Trading Partners field 290 that lists the current trading partners of a particular seller client 24. A user of a seller client 24 may add trading clients 26, edit current trading relationships, or remove trading clients 26 using

Add button 292, Edit button 294, and Remove button 296, respectively. Upon activating Add button 292, Trading Partner subgroup 206 presents a list of all members of the system 10 that are not currently trading partners of the seller client 24. A seller client 24 may establish a trading relationship with one or more of these available trading clients 26 to authorize it to purchase products from the seller client 24. See also col. 21, lines 53-67.

Clearly, Fig. 9 of O'Neill lists all current trading partners, not just active trading partners. Upon activating Add button 292, Trading Partner subgroup 206 presents a list of all members of the system 10 that are not currently trading partners (non-partners, not inactive partners). It is noted that in the present invention only active e-commerce partners (not all partners) are listed.

Therefore, O'Neill does not disclose, *inter alia*, for each of the e-commerce partners automatically determining by an active engine of the e-commerce application whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner based on at least one predetermined criteria, wherein determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner comprises at least one of the following steps, each step being based on a corresponding criterion: detecting whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period, determining whether transactions involving said e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold, determining whether a transaction involving said e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size, and determining whether said e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level, wherein the corresponding criteria for determining whether an e-commerce partner is an active partner are adjustable; and presenting a list of active e-commerce partners within the commerce graphical user interface, as recited in independent Claims 1, 29, and 36 of the instant application.

The other references do not make up for the deficiencies of O'Neill as discussed above.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1, 29, and 36. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 1, 29, and 36 define over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claims 1 or 29 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG LLP

Date: March 29, 2010

/Gregory A. Nelson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577

Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150

NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG LLP

Customer No. 40987

525 Okeechobee Boulevard, 15th Floor

West Palm Beach, FL 33401

Telephone: (561) 847-7800